

REMARKS

In response to the Examiner's objections to the specification and drawings applicants have amended both the specification and the drawings and attached are a 2nd substitute specification (and a 2nd marked copy of the specification) and a new sheet of drawings amended to show the features called for in claims 4 and 17 as requested by the Examiner. The cross sections shown in Fig.'s. 6 and 7 and referred to in the 2nd substitute specification are conventional, old in the art and contain no new matter.

The Examiner's rejection of claim 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for being unpatentable over the Hamaguchi U.S. Patent No. 6,626,266 in view the Heikkinen U.S. Patent No. 4,756,388, Damien U.S. Patent No. 5,651,245 and Wilcox U.S. Patent No. 4,624,097 and, for some claims, further in view of De Angelis et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,566,786 and/or Aulanko U.S. Patent No. 5,429,211 and/or Honda U.S. Patent No. 4,591,025 and/or Hollowell International Application 99/43595, as these rejections may be attempted to be applied against the amended claims, is respectfully traversed.

In support of this traverse, it is pointed out that amended claim 1 now calls for the double wrap feature argued before plus the features of claims 4 and 5.

The double wrap improves traction in the machine and compensates for any poor traction of the cables in the semicircular grooves. The semicircular grooves decrease wear on the cables and compensates for any additional stress on the cable by reason of the low ratio of less than 40 between the drive sheave diameter and the cable diameter.

The advantage of this construction is that the small diameter ration and small diameter cable enable the use of a small diameter traction sheave. This results in a lower torque requirement for the motor which results in a smaller, less costly and more easily installed elevator machine (in the elevator shaft).

Applicant submits that the amended claims, the elevator construction defined therein and the advantages, described above, obtained with this construction are novel and unobvious from the references cited by the Examiner, considering them individually or in combination.

In summary, applicant submits that upon entry of the above amendments to the specification, claims and drawings, it will be clear that the claims are

distinguished over the prior art cited, and that the application is otherwise in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action to that end is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

WELSH & KATZ, LTD.

By

Thomas R. Vigil

Thomas R. Vigil

Registration No. 24,542

Date: November 1, 2006

WELSH & KATZ, LTD.
120 South Riverside Plaza
22nd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 655-1500